

## Unknown

---

**From:** nali065@uottawa.ca  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 19, 2012 5:48 PM  
**To:** Gordon Robertson  
**Subject:** [Fwd: RE: Examiners] - follow up

Dr. Robertson:

As per your instructions I am not to contact the Dean of FGPS or FPGS.  
Further as per your email below, point number 2, you said you would discuss this matter with the dean. Has this happened? Please advice of your plan?

Many thanks, Nicholas

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Examiners  
From: "Gordon Robertson" <dger@uottawa.ca>  
Date: Sun, 9 September, 2012 12:14 pm  
To: "nali065@uottawa.ca" <nali065@uottawa.ca>  
"Gholamreza Rouhi" <grouhi@uottawa.ca>

- 1) You interactions often lead to more problems. Good news is only when the papers are accepted.
- 2) I will talk to the Dean and will help to find a fourth examiner.
- 3) I am not allowed to talk to the examiners about the thesis. (I have a letter to that effect.)
- 4) I will assist and any decision he makes may not be final.

-----Original Message-----

From: nali065@uottawa.ca [mailto:nali065@uottawa.ca]  
Sent: September 9, 2012 10:20 AM  
To: Gordon Robertson; Gholamreza Rouhi  
Subject: RE: Examiners

Dr. Robertson and Dr. Rouhi:

Thanks for your input. I understand your direction.  
The reviewers responses on both publications is proof that academics is not involved in the review of my thesis. Here are my thoughts.  
It is Dr. Lemaire that withdrawn (greatest blow that he can give me). Dr. Benoit will retain a fail score. Dr. Caldwell will give a pass. Dr. Labrosse a pass. If this is the case is it possible for me to fail given there is not a majority of fails? Please confirm? Can Dr. Hastings decision replace the examiner that withdrawn?

- 1) Why are you against me sharing progress/ good news with the faculty and dean on the publications?
- 2) What is your plan if we receive a negative decision from the dean?
- 3) What have you done to date to resolve contentious issues with all examiners?
- 4) Finally, it would be very difficult for me to wait to refute a decision made by the dean as opposed to providing him with intel to assist him in his decision making. Will you be assisting me in my fight to overcome this challenge?

Nicholas

> DO agree. As already said there will be no benefit for you if talk  
> with the Dean. You need to be patient, Nicholas.  
>  
> Moreover, we've to see why they have been provoked to show this kind  
> of apparently odd behavior. Did you resolve duplicate publication problem?.  
> I've assumed that it was not done purposefully and it's not your  
> fault, otherwise, I also could not trust you. Let me know if I can  
> help with this critical/open issue.  
> GR  
>  
>  
>> There is nothing to be done for the moment. Wait for the Dean to  
>> decide what is necessary.  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: nali065@uottawa.ca [mailto:nali065@uottawa.ca]  
>> Sent: September 8, 2012 12:02 PM  
>> To: Gordon Robertson; Gholamreza Rouhi  
>> Subject: RE: Examiners  
>>  
>> Dr. Robertson and Dr. Rouhi:  
>>  
>> Be aware that the SHK thesis requirement for a phd is by far exceeded  
>> by my thesis in its submitted form. The two papers submitted for  
>> acceptance is NOT required for graduation. These papers when accepted  
>> will not change the minds of the folks at SHK but perhaps the dean of  
>> FGPS, who is the decision maker at this time but unaware of the  
>> progress we have made to date. There is a limit to everything and  
>> this is the third time that an examiner has withdrawn without any  
>> substantial reason from my committee.  
>> I  
>> am seeking guidance on this matter.  
>> Nicholas  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>> I do agree with Gord, Nicholas. If we have both revised papers  
>>> accepted, then the story would be different. Approaching them at  
>>> this stage is not only beneficial but also may be harmful for your  
>>> reputation and the merit of your work and your advisers.  
>>>  
>>> Regarding suggesting a new examiner, I somehow agree with Nicholas.  
>>> It was their duty to manage the process, but not us. The examiner  
>>> who changed his mind, why he raised numerous questions, and wasted  
>>> our time to fully address them. He can not change his mind at this  
>>> stage, in my opinion- UOttawa should resolve this issue, but not us.  
>>>  
>>> To be frank, I do agree with Nicholas that politics is GREATLY at  
>>> play in this thesis evaluation process. I'm more sorry for them than  
>>> for us, because they're torturing themselves by unfairly evaluating  
>>> a student's work who spent almost 5 years of his life and did, in my  
>>> opinion, a quite acceptable PhD level research.  
>>>  
>>> Anyways, if you want to propose new examiners, I'd suggest either of  
>>> the following from Carleton:  
>>> D.L. Russell  
>>> H. Frei  
>>>

>>> Last, I'm positive we'll hear good news regarding the last 2 revised  
>>> papers, which can greatly help to convince the Dean that this thesis  
>>> has a great scientific merit and can also appreciate the thesis  
>>> advisers' effort (that I can not see in their behavior at the moment  
>>> (?!)).  
>>>  
>>> Never give up Nicholas- you'll be happy soon.  
>>> cheers,  
>>> GR  
>>>  
>>> --  
>>> Gholamreza Rouhi, PhD  
>>> Assistant Professor, Faculty of Biomedical Engineering, Amirkabir  
>>> University of Technology, Tehran, Iran <http://bme2.aut.ac.ir/odbl/>  
>>>  
>>> Adjunct Professor, Faculty of Health Sciences, School of Human  
>>> Kinetics, University of Ottawa, ON, Canada  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> Dr. Robertson:  
>>>>  
>>>> Thanks for the feedback. I understand your position. Please do try  
>>>> to understand mine. It is now my fifth year and I am stuck here, why?  
>>>>  
>>>> My perspective is obtaining another examiner is not required.  
>>>> Rational:  
>>>> My  
>>>> thesis is comprised of 5 journal papers, two published, two will be  
>>>> accepted and one under review. So the question is why am I here?  
>>>> Certainly  
>>>> not academic calibre. So what else is there?  
>>>>  
>>>> Providing the dean the journal reviewers comments NOW on the two  
>>>> papers in my opinion will help. This will serve as an exercise to  
>>>> compare the disparate views of examiners and journal reviewers. As  
>>>> these journal paper reviewers are objective and authoratative can  
>>>> help our case and compel the dean NOT to explore the need of  
>>>> another reviewer. Recall my thesis IS the journal papers. So  
>>>> waiting gives the Dean of FGPS no background knowledge of the very  
>>>> good news and work conducted to date and further help him  
>>>> understand that my thesis merits a phd.  
>>>>  
>>>> Adding a fourth examiner is only required if more than two examiner  
>>>> from the three remaining is negative which I pray will not happen  
>>>> given the amount of work I put in to address ALL examiners comments.  
>>>>  
>>>> Nicholas  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> Do not send any messages to the Dean. Wait for the verdict from  
>>>>> the committee. Afterwards you can meet with the Dean if necessary.  
>>>>> This is NOT the time to stir the pot.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will likely need to find another examiner. Any suggestions,  
>>>>> especially from engineering?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>>>> From: nali065@uottawa.ca [mailto:[nali065@uottawa.ca](mailto:nali065@uottawa.ca)]  
>>>>> Sent: September 7, 2012 11:29 AM  
>>>>> To: Gordon Robertson  
>>>>> Cc: Gholamreza Rouhi  
>>>>> Subject: Re: Examiners  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Dr. Robertson:

